

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **Remarks**

Before considering the matters raised in the Office Action, it is noted that two very minor changes have been made in the specification at page 4.

Turning now to the requirement for restriction, restriction has been required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 between the claims of Group I, viz., claims 1-19, and the claims of Group II, viz., claims 20-27. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are not related as combination and sub-combination as contended in the Office Action. Claim 1, for example, is a method claim which is broader than apparatus claims 20 and 26 and, in that sense, is generic to these claims. Moreover, similar remarks apply to amended claim 13, i.e., claim 13 is generic to claims 20 and 26 at least insofar as the recitation of the particular fault being detected is concerned. The fact that claims 20 and 26 particularly concern connectivity faults does not make claims 20 and 26 "sub-combination" claims; these claims are merely more narrow versions of claims 1 and 8, at least insofar as the particular fault to be detected is concerned. A sub-combination claim is something quite different than a claim that is merely more specific than. Further, with respect to the classification of the claims subclass 43 is indented in the classification of class 714 under class 25 so that both subclasses would have to be searched in order to do a complete search. Further, claim 2 refers to the fault condition being at least one of "lack of connectivity" while claim 7 refers to the graphical depiction as being a color coded monitor cable being plugged into a color coded connector (and hence also relates to connectivity). Moreover, new claim 29, which depends from claim 13, recites that the apparatus includes a connector and the detecting means detects whether a proper

connection has been made with the connector. Thus, these claims, and in particular, claim 29, are of a similar scope to claims 20 and 26 at least insofar as the fault being detected is concerned. For all of the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the requirement for restriction here should be withdrawn, and claims 20-27 should be examined along with claims 1-19.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-15 and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Gettemy et al reference (hereinafter "Gettemy"). This rejection is respectfully traversed although claim 13 has been amended to more clearly define over this particular reference.

Turning first to claim 1, it is agreed that "Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, detecting when the battery falls below a certain predetermined threshold" and that "Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-25, providing a message that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life." However, while it is agreed that a message is provided "which informs the user that the display mode of the screen can be changed to enhance the battery life," it is respectfully submitted that this is not a solution to correcting the fault. The solution would be to change the battery whereas changing the display merely prolongs the problem of having a weak battery and does not provide a solution.

With respect to claim 8, it is not seen that the Gettemy patent discloses providing a help routine including a list of functions and that an apparatus is capable of performing nor either the other two steps of claim 8. In the discussion of the rejection of claim 8, the Office Action refers to the same lines of the Gettemy patent and states that these lines teach "providing a message, on the display screen, that allows the user to change

the display to prolong battery life.” It is respectfully submitted that this is not a teaching of “providing a help routine including a list of functions an apparatus is capable of performing.”

With respect to independent claim 13, this claim has been amended to more clearly define over the Gettemy patent and recites, *inter alia*, detecting means for detecting a fault condition and a controller that determines a probable solution for correcting the fault condition as well as determines an appropriate graphical depiction of the probable solution. Again, it is respectfully submitted that the Gettemy patent does not disclose a solution for correcting the low battery condition but rather merely prolongs the battery life by switching the selectable display mode.

Claims 3, 6 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being “unpatentable over” the Gettemy patent and the Kim patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the lines of the Kim patent to which reference has been made in the Office Action, Kim provides for displaying a pictorial image on a screen “in either the state the input video signal has been disabled or the state where the video signal has been connected from an external computer system.” It is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching in the Kim patent of providing a pictorial depiction of a solution to correcting these problems. This is evident from the lines cited in the Office Action as well as the “display exhibits” shown on the screens depicted in Figures 3A-3C. In this regard, Figure 3A shows a display which is designed “to illustrate, collectively or separately, the chromaticity and entirety of each video component colors red R, green G and blue B” while Figure 3B shows “a display of a cross-hatched type designed for adjustment of a

preset video mode” wherein “such parameters as convergence or linearity characteristics of a CRT are provided, such that information about the CRT regarding this mode can be identified by the viewer” and in Figure 3C “a plurality of messages required for an initial setting up of a video display screen are displayed in a sequential manner.” In the latter case, Kim provides that these messages can include “a message representing no connection between cable connector and a cable of external system” but no solution is displayed.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy and Petty et al (hereinafter “Petty”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While the Petty patent discloses an apparatus wherein a plurality of status icons is selected and sequentially displayed for a predetermined time period, there is no teaching in Petty with respect to providing a graphical display of a solution for correcting a fault condition. Hence, claim 4 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of parent claim 1.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Gettemy, Kim and Friesen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Friesen patent merely discloses a microcomputer system with color coded components. This teaching is characterized in the Office Action as being of “color-coded cables being plugged into color-coded ports.” It is respectfully submitted that there mere fact that color-coded cables have been plugged into color-coded ports in the prior art (something that Applicant freely admits) is not teaching of the subject matter of claim 7, i.e., there is no teaching in any of the references which would lead to providing a graphical depiction of a color-coded monitor cable being plugged into a

color-coded connector. Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable for this reason as well as the reasons set forth above in support of parent claim 1.

Claims 20-27 are patentable for similar reasons to those discussed above, with claim 20 reciting, *inter alia*, means for displaying on a display a pictographical solution for providing a proper connection with a connector in the event that a detecting means detects that a proper connection is not made with the conductor, while claim 26 recites means for displaying on a display an iconographical depiction for a user a solution with which the user can cause a proper connection to be made with a connector disposed in the housing including the display.” It is respectfully submitted that, for at least some of the same reasons that were set forth above, these claims are clearly patentable over the cited references.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

**END REMARKS**